

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 385

UD 020 918

AUTHOR Brumberg, Stephan F.: Toledo, Victor
 TITLE Final Evaluation Report for the C.S. 211 Bilingual Gifted and Talented Program 1978-1979.
 INSTITUTION National Training and Evaluation Center, New York, N.Y.
 SPONS AGENCY Community School District 12, Bronx, N.Y.
 PUB DATE [79]
 GRANT G00700624
 NOTE 31p.: Appendix I (Student Questionnaire) has been deleted due to reproducibility factors.
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: *Bilingual Education: Elementary Education: *Gifted: Program Descriptions: *Program Effectiveness: Program Evaluation: Resource Staff: Spanish: Theater Arts
 IDENTIFIERS Bilingual Education Act 1968: New York (Bronx)

ABSTRACT

This report provides a program description and evaluation findings of a bilingual program for gifted and talented children conducted at C.S. 211, an elementary school serving black and Hispanic children in an economically deprived area of the Bronx, New York. The program's goals, which included above grade level reading and mathematics performance in the children's native language and acquisition of the second language, are reviewed. Instructional practices, curriculum and materials development, and staff development designed to accomplish these goals are described. Program activities for the 1978-79 academic year, including classroom and performing arts activities, are reviewed. The Bilingual Gifted and Talented Program is positively evaluated, with particular praise given to the teaching staff of C.S. 211. Based on observations, on comparisons of achievement test data with the District average, and on results from a student questionnaire, it is recommended that funding for the program be continued. Problem areas relating to the program's scope, administration, selection and testing procedures, and staff utilization are also identified and discussed. (GC)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

AUG 22 1980

ED193385

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR THE

C.S. 211 BILINGUAL GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM 1978-1979

Grant Award Number G00700624
Project Number 5055-97603

(Partially funded under an ESEA Title VII Grant)

Submitted to:

Dr. Peter J. Negroni, Superintendent
New York City Community School District 12

and

Evelyn Colon LaFontaine, Principal
C.S.211

Prepared by:

Stephan F. Brumberg, Ed.D.

and

Victor Toledo

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Edmonds
NYC Bd of Ed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

W0020918

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Overview	1
B. Program Overview	3
Instructional Program	3
Curriculum and Materials Development	4
Staff Development	4
C. Program Data	5
II. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	6
III. FINDINGS	12
A. On-Site Observations	12
Physical Plant	12
Observations of Teaching	14
Special Consultants	16
Parent ESL Class	17
B. Test Results	17
C. Student Questionnaire	19
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
APPENDIXES	26

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR THE

C.S. 211 BILINGUAL GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM 1978-1979

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview

This past academic year, 1978-1979, represented the second year of the Bilingual Gifted and Talented Program at C.S. 211, as well as the completion of the school's first decade. C.S. 211, located in Community School District 12, the Bronx, New York City, has been a leader in the development of a total bilingual school (K-6) since its founding in 1969. Located in one of the most depressed and economically deprived urban areas of the country, it has been able to provide a high quality bilingual, bicultural education to Spanish dominant, English dominant and bilingual (Spanish-English) children drawn from throughout the district. As stated in the Title VII evaluation for 1976-1977, "...the objective of C.S. 211 was to have each child functioning at or above grade level in reading and math in his/her dominant language, and to foster the mastery of the second language. In fact, in classroom observations, children who had attended C.S. 211 from kindergarten through grade 5 or grade 6, were observed to be very fluent in oral use of the second language, even if there was not native facility."¹

In addition to language learning and language maintenance

1. A. Babian and V. Toledo, "Final Evaluation Report for the District
12 Bilingual School, 211 (1976-1977)", National Training and Evaluation
Center, N.Y., N.Y., 1977, p. 1f.

in two languages and a multi-cultural orientation (largely Hispanic and Afro-American) to the curriculum, C.S. 211 emphasizes flexible programming and an individual approach to instruction. Children are grouped by abilities, not age or grade, for language instruction in both dominant and second language, reading and math. As noted in an earlier evaluation, "...this placement by proficiency, rather than age, resulted in the well balanced groups observed. Children were regularly regrouped throughout the day for instruction in the different content areas and the flexible programming was observed to benefit most children. This complicated system was only practicable, however, because of the constant vigilance and excellent supervision provided by the administration, as well as the talent and good will of the teachers."¹

The school's long experience with flexible ability grouping facilitated the implementation of its Gifted and Talented Program, as students were already accustomed to grouping and regrouping during the course of the day for particular activities. Also, there was no invidious distinction between and among groups and activities. Students had learned to respect individual differences in interests, abilities, and talents.

The concern for providing relevant and quality education to meet the individual needs of the children of the depressed area being served, led the administration of C.S. 211 to propose a program for the gifted and talented children enrolled at the school. In the application for funding they argued that:

Gifted and talented pupils are exceptional and have
unique educational needs;

I. Ibid., p.4.

Most of the special programs provided for gifted children are located in middle and upper class schools;

More equitable opportunity for the gifted, located in the less privileged segments of our society is a must;

Provisions made do not reach children who have difficulty with the English language;

C.S. 211, located in a very low-income neighborhood, and with a school population of 730 pupils, has identified near to 92 limited English speaking gifted children, which represents close to 13% of its school population;

The gifted and talented bilingual and limited English speaking child is still being neglected, particularly by those programs being funded under Title VII monies.

It is essential that early identification and programming for the gifted and talented among the non-English speaking and bilingual school population:

be provided at the time of school entry;

and that the abilities and talents of gifted and talented children whose language is not English be adequately recognized through a carefully planned and well developed program of bilingual, bicultural education.

B. Program Overview

The ambitious goals of the Gifted and Talented Program were translated into an equally ambitious set of program objectives.

These objectives can be categorized into three major areas:

Instructional programs, curriculum and materials development, and staff development.

Instructional Program

1. Enhanced achievement in English as a second language for children with no or limited English speaking ability.
2. Enhanced competency in Spanish for Spanish speaking students.
3. Spanish as a second language for targeted gifted and talented children who are English monolingual (of Hispanic and non-Hispanic background).
4. Science enrichment, with special attention to experimentation and scientific method (with instruction in both English and Spanish).

5. Enhanced mathematics achievement (with instruction in both English and Spanish).
6. To offer a program of career awareness and self-development.
7. To acquire basic skills in reading and comprehension as well as critical thinking skills.

Curriculum and Materials Development

1. Produce relevant, individualized teaching materials in the curriculum areas (Spanish Language, English as a Second Language, Spanish enrichment, Math, Career awareness and Cultural awareness--with special reference to the Hispanic and Afro-American child).
2. Develop curriculum in the arts (drama, graphics, dance and music) for the gifted and talented child, to be used as a vehicle for self-expression and second language learning.
3. Development of an audio-visual center to introduce photography as a learning vehicle.
4. The development of a library media center for staff and students.

Staff Development

A program of staff development will be offered to teachers and paraprofessionals at C.S. 211 so that they will:

1. Understand the concept and execution of a program for the gifted and talented child (including the means of identifying such children from among non-English speaking and bilingual children).
2. Become familiar with studies, materials and teaching methods appropriate to the gifted and talented child who is also bilingual.
3. Develop an understanding of theory, rationale and practice of a bilingual educational program.
4. Develop learning centers in language (Spanish and English), math and science.

Related to staff development are the objectives of improving school - parent relations and of involving parents more fully in the life and the program of the school.

The first year of the Gifted and Talented Program, 1977-1978, the focus was upon selection and development of instructional materials (in career awareness, cultural awareness and thinking skills), and initial implementation of the instructional program. In this, the second year of the program, the focus shifted to staff development (in accord with a recommendation in last year's Final Report) and continued implementation of two major components of the instructional program -- language arts curricula in both English and Spanish, and the arts curriculum (drama, dance and music, and graphics). No significant work was undertaken on materials development this year. A full discussion of program activities for 1978-1979 appears below.

C. Program Data

The testing program for the gifted and talented was delayed this year, and as a result only the Stanford Achievement Test in Reading (English Language) was administered to most of the target children on a pre-post basis. Some, though not all, children had also taken the LAB Test, but the lack of a complete set of scores obviated the need to analyze these scattered Spanish language measures. Also available for target children from the second through sixth grades were their scores on the 1979 New York City Reading Test. These scores were aggregated and the results presented. No measures were available for mathematics achievement, nor for science achievement. The available test data, although limited, did permit at least a gross measure of achievement for the students in the program.

II. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The set of objectives established for the Gifted and Talented Program, as initially submitted, was extremely ambitious. As the program evolved over the course of its first year, a number of objectives were not pursued. However, in the renewal application for 1978-1979, nearly all of the original objectives have been retained. Between the submission of the renewal application and the commencement of the school year there was a change in the principalship at C.S. 211. The new principal, who also serves as Project Director, had to familiarize herself with a new school, and introduce changes in the school's administration and instructional program all at the same time. In the absence of an assigned assistant principal, virtually all administrative responsibilities devolved upon the principal. As a result, there was insufficient time to start the regular school program and the Gifted and Talented Program at the same time. As the Gifted and Talented Project was to supplement the regular program, it had to wait until changes introduced in the regular program were implemented.

1. It was not until late November that activities under the Gifted and Talented Program got underway. At this time final selection of target children was completed. Unlike the first year, where a teacher-completed screening instrument was used to identify children, this year, a simplified teacher recommendation form was used, asking classroom teachers to identify gifted and/or talented children in their classes (a short outline of identifiable traits to look for was supplied to all teachers).

A final list of target children, however, was not completed until December. Of course, many of the students had been in the program the previous year, but many were new to the program (new entrants to the school as well as previously unidentified gifted and/or talented children).

The first year of the program, 110 target children were scattered among 10 different classes. In the second year, in accord with last year's recommendations, the 123 target children were assigned to fewer classes, with the great majority assigned to 4 teachers. This facilitated the provision of special services and activities to the target youngsters. The final distribution of target students by grade and by giftedness and/or talent is outlined in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Gifted and Talented Students by Grade and Category of Gifted or Talented.

Grade	Gifted & Talented	Gifted	Talented	Total
1	1	5	14	20
2	2	13	1	16
3		19	1	20
4	11	5	6	22
5		7	5	12
6	8	20	5	33
	22	69	32	123

2. Due to the late start it was decided to focus the instructional program for the Gifted and Talented Program on Language Arts (English and Spanish) and the Arts (visual and performing)

which would be employed to enrich and enhance achievement in the Language Arts while encouraging self-expression, self-realization, and the actualization of students' talents.

3. Three teachers were assigned to the project on a full-time basis. However, they could not be freed to work on the project in some cases until well into the first term. These three bilingual resources teachers ultimately assumed the following responsibilities: one was placed in charge of program administration including the coordination of the testing program and the ordering of materials; one had the prime role of assisting classroom teachers who had high concentrations of target children with special reading and language arts activities and in working with the writing consultant (unfortunately, the Bilingual Resource teacher was on leave for most of the second term and her duties had to be shared by the other two Resource Teachers); and one Bilingual Resource teacher whose responsibilities involved student guidance and parent-school relations. Also assigned to the project were four para professionals (one of whom was later transferred) who began work in September and were assigned to those classes with high concentration of target children.

4. The delay in getting the project underway severely hampered the proposed testing program. The grant application set forth an ambitious testing program for the project in order to yield necessary data for program evaluation. In practice, however, the lack of valid and reliable standardized testing instruments to measure achievement in the various content areas in both English and Spanish made adequate testing problematic. The delay

in implementation coupled with the lack of appropriate instruments meant that it was not until February that the one instrument administered on a pre-post basis was finally given to the target population. With posttesting in mid-June, this only allowed a four-month time lapse, generally considered insufficient to measure change in a program of this type. The data, however, were tabulated and analyzed and the results appear in Table 2. No consistent measure of Spanish Language achievement is available for the entire target population. It is hoped that such a measure will be provided in subsequent years.

5. As the project got underway in the second semester, various consultants were engaged to provide special instruction to the Gifted and Talented students. One consultant, from the Teachers and Writers Collaborative, visited the classes with concentrations of Gifted and Talented children for ten weekly sessions. These creative writing sessions related directly to the Language Arts objectives of the project and served as a bridge to the Performing and Visual Arts component.

6. Special consultants were also contracted in the visual arts (for seven weekly sessions), dance (six weekly sessions), and drama (10 all-day visits by a consultant from the "Young Audiences" organization). These special consultants in the arts carried forward the well received activities in the visual arts, drama and dance. Most of the target children worked with two of the three Arts consultants in small group settings for one-hour to one-and-a-quarter hours per class. The results of a

student questionnaire indicate that these sessions were very well received.

7. A photography component, materials for which were purchased last year and are being stored in the school, has yet to be implemented. It is hoped that either a consultant be engaged for the coming year, an interested staff member be offered appropriate training in photography so that it can be implemented in the coming year.

8. The Bilingual Resource teachers procured materials for the classroom teachers to use with their students. They also provided materials to the paraprofessionals working with the gifted and talented children, primarily in reading and mathematics.

9. Five Title VII parent workshops were offered this year, commencing in October with last offered in May. The topics of these workshops, organized by one of the Bilingual Resource teachers, were as follows: crime prevention and safety; how parents can help their youngsters to read; how to handle your child when upset and distracted; orientation to the bilingual program at C.S. 211 and the related Gifted and Talented Program; and teaching children math through math games. Average parent attendance was 30 to 35 per session, with many parents of the target children who were specifically invited.

10. An English as a Second Language course was offered to parents of all C.S. 211 children. Given in the mornings, and led by one of the Bilingual Resource teachers, average attendance was 12 parents -- mother and fathers -- and appears to have been very well received by the parent community.

11. A number of program objectives relate to staff development. In the first year of the project, little formal training had been offered to the teaching staff. This year, however commencing in the fall semester, and continuing into the Spring, 15 teachers on an individual basis, took 25 Masters Level courses at a number of local universities, all related to one of the following pertinent topics: bilingual education; the teaching of gifted and talented children; and methods of teaching reading in English and Spanish. In addition, in the fall semester, the Project contracted with Fordham University to give a course, at C.S.211, for twelve staff members on "Teaching the Gifted." The course was tailored to the unique needs of the population at C.S. 211. In the Spring semester, 14 staff members received a second three-credit graduate level course from Fordham entitled "Uncovering and Developing Academic Talent." This strong in-service training effort, directly related to the Bilingual Gifted and Talented Program, more than responds to last year's training recommendation and goes a long way toward meeting the ambitious training objectives outlined in the project proposal.

12. As part of the Title VII activities, the school published a booklet entitled The Title VII, C.S. 211 Gifted and Talented Program. This photo-illustrated publication, in both English and Spanish, seeks to publicize and explain the program to the community, and, in turn, recruit potential target children from throughout the District.

The Gifted and Talented Program at C.S. 211, while not able to undertake the full, ambitious activities set forth in the original grant application, was able to identify its target pop-

ulation, assign these children to program classes, and structure and schedule a program for them which allowed for participation in regular ability grouping instruction in language arts and reading (English and Spanish) and math, and participation in special program activities (creative writing, dance, drama and art). Problems had been encountered and delays experienced, but the program base was maintained in the second year from which further development could be anticipated in the forthcoming academic year.

III. FINDINGS

A. On-Site Observations

Six visits were made to C.S. 211 during the winter and spring of 1978-1979. Physically, C.S. 211 is housed in a converted factory building, with the ground-floor a combination cafeteria-commons room, and floors two through four containing classrooms. The "penthouse" contains a play area-music/dance space. To promote the school's open classroom strategy, an open plan was adopted for class space. With no permanent physical dividers between class groups, the noise level was often quite high. While the flexibility of the open plan was admirable, the noise and distractions were undesirable. Despite these distractions, the teachers were able to hold the attention of their groups generally. Often, however, children would be distracted, and teachers tended to plan passive activities so as not to disturb adjacent groups. There is little provision for recreational space either outside (where a closed off city street serves as the only play area) or indoors. Since children were expected to be relatively quiet

and physically passive during class, this was not the most desirable circumstance. The physical activities which formed part of the Gifted and Talented Program (dance, drama), were particularly well received by the students, perhaps in part because of the generally confining nature of the regular school program.

Teachers did seek to make their teaching areas attractive by the display of student work, poster, etc. The absence of wall space, however, limited the amount of material that could be displayed.

The students in the Gifted and Talented Program were heterogeneously grouped with other children in the school (though they tended to be concentrated in four classes) and all benefited by the school's flexible programming and individualized approach to teaching. There is a complicated arrangement of grouping and regrouping for instruction in all areas based on a child's ability in the language of instruction as well as the subject of instruction. Since children were placed according to abilities, not age, a group might consist of children who would normally be in grades 2, 3, and 4 in a regular school. This resulted in generally well-balanced groups and facilitated appropriate enrichment and/or remediation for a given child in language and content areas. The high caliber of administration at the school, as well as the high degree of competence on the part of the teaching staff, was crucial in making this complex system succeed.

Observations of Teaching

At the end of April, the four teachers with high concentrations of gifted and talented children in their classes, were observed during their regular classroom periods. (A copy of the Observation Schedule used is included in the appendix to this report.) All were in their regular classroom spaces, although two used informal settings within the larger area. Largely due to the open floor plan, background noise was experienced in each of the classes. For the second grade class observed, the noise became overwhelming and led to student inattention, some acting out, and a premature ending of the lesson.

Two classes observed (fourth and sixth grade) used the whole class as the basic unit of instruction, while the second and third grade teachers made use of grouping. Only one class observed had the paraprofessional present and she worked with a small group in reading skills reinforcement. The other teachers worked alone for the observed lessons. In all classes, the dominant form of interaction was teacher initiated teacher-student interactions, and almost exclusively verbal interactions. The level of interchange, however, was quite high and occasional student initiated interactions were observed.

Different kinds of teaching materials were used in each of the four classes. They ranged from textbooks, trade books (used as source material for student research), student-made materials (that one teacher used as the basis for language arts-science-math interrelated lessons), maps, xeroxed materials, and a

chalkboard with teacher-made activities.

In all classes observed, the dominant language of both teachers and students was English. All teachers were very fluent in English, although a few teachers' accents belied the fact that they were not native English speakers. Nearly all students in these classes were fluent in English. However, in two of the observed classes Spanish was used quite frequently, perhaps 30% of the time.

When interviewed, three of the teachers reported they gave no extra attention to the gifted and talented students in the class, since they represented nearly the entire class roster. In one case, a teacher reported assigning extra work, including independent research to the target students.

The perceived level of performance of the target students was high. They were able to raise good questions and to give good answers to teacher raised questions. There was good participation in the four classes, and nearly all children in these groups were well behaved.

Two of the classes observed tended to be relatively formal, while two were informal in structure. In three of the classes, teacher direction was judged to be moderate and in one high.

The four teachers observed are all highly competent professionals, each following his or her own teaching style. They are enthusiastic, accepting of their students, lively, involved, interested, and humane. These formal observations corroborate the evaluators' judgments of these teachers based on informal observations during the past two years in almost twenty-five visits.

Special Consultants

The evaluators were able to observe two of the special consultants who visited C.S. 211 in the spring semester; the creative writing consultant, and the dance consultant. These two individuals, along with the drama and visual arts consultants, have impressive professional credentials in their fields and exhibited considerable skill in working with youngsters. On the day the writing consultant was observed, she had been unavoidably detained and arrived late. However, the regular classroom teacher (one of those observed) began the creative writing lesson utilizing the same techniques and approaches emphasized by the consultant. The students clearly enjoyed the activity and the consultant had been twice successful; the students were producing some exciting verbal images, and the classroom teacher had learned a valuable set of new teaching skills.

Also observed was the dance consultant, a regular member of the Ballet Hispanico Dance Company. The class was held on the roof-top music room with 17 students drawn from target children in the fifth and sixth grades. The students exhibited great enthusiasm and high involvement in the dance lesson (dealing with hand-foot-body coordination) which lasted for just over an hour. They were obviously happy to engage in expressive physical activities not normally a part of their school experience.

It should be noted that concentrating the target children in four classes has facilitated the scheduling of special activities, a problem experienced the previous year. However, the few

target children scattered in other classes still present a scheduling problem.

Parent ESL Class

One of the ESL-Parent class sessions was observed that was held in a science room-teacher lunch room. Eight mothers and one father were present on the morning of the observation that lasted approximately 45 minutes. The setting and interactions were informal, softening the usual harshness of language drills. The student-parents were all highly responsive and were highly attendant to task. There was excellent rapport between teacher (one of the bilingual Resource teachers) and parent-students. The class made use of an ESL textbook and for approximately 90% of class time the group spoke in English. There was occasional backsliding into Spanish, but the teacher was skillful in returning the class to English. Although the teacher was perfectly fluent in English, the students possessed varying levels of English language competence. However, all were able to perform at an adequate level during the lesson for the tasks assigned.

The class sessions were clearly valued by these parents who found it of great utility. The teacher demonstrated high professional competence, although English as a Second Language was not his field of specialization. If resources are available, the Spanish language classes should be continued in the coming year both for their intrinsic value to participants, as well as for the good will it generates in school-community relations.

B. Test Results

As indicated, the only available pre-post test measure was the Stanford Achievement Test in Reading. It must be recalled, however,

that the pretest was not administered until late February and the posttest in mid-June, allowing less than four months to register any gains. Given these limitations, the data were tabulated and the results appear in Table 2.

Table 2. Correlated t-test on Stanford Achievement Test Raw Scores by Grade level.

grade	N	Pretest Mean	SD	Posttest Mean	SD	diff	t	p	Test Form	Level
1	17	96	16.23	103.2	11.7	7.18	3.63	.05	A-B	I SESAT
2	12	217	22.56	213.58	36.38	-3.5	.69	NS	A-B	II SESAT
3	16	144	28.41	148	31.78	3.75	1.32	NS	A-B	PII SAT
4	16	113	26.34	111	32.88	1.63	.64	NS	A-B	PIII SAT
5	9	120	40.26	116	48.89	-3.67	.61	NS	A-B	Int I SAT
6	29	110	25.03	111	25.33	.92	.78	NS	A-B	IntII SAT

Since the publishers norm dates were not observed, grade level data would not have been meaningful. Therefore, raw score were analyzed and a correlated t-test was applied to pre-post scores.

Statistical significance was obtained in grade 1 only. Since the test was applied to raw scores, no positive conclusions should be assumed from these data. In some instances, some students showed a decrement from pre to post testing. Different forms of the SAT were administered and it is likely that these forms are not equivalent for this population. The above data are somewhat offset by the high score obtained by the target students on the New York City Reading Test (see table 3).

Table 3. Mean Scores on the New York City Reading Test by Grade for Targeted Students

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>
2	2.7	1.14
3	3.6	1.24
4	5.2	1.51
5	7.2	2.4
6	7.3	1.98

At all grade levels the target population outscored their grade-mates in C.S. 211 as well as throughout the District, and except for the third grade, where they scored one month below the national norm, every grade scored well above the national norms for their grade. This is probably both an indication of the programs effects on student learning, as well a factor of the initial selection of students. At this point it is not possible to partial out the effects of these two variables, but with a controlled study, the effects of this special program can be made evident.

C. Student Questionnaire

Students' attitudes toward the program were measured by the administration of a questionnaire dealing with three major areas: student affect; program content; and general program organization. Forty-four students in grades four through six responded. A copy of the questionnaire appears in the appendix.

Students were very positive and apparently realistic in their perceptions of the affective domain. When asked if they liked coming to school 30 (68%) responded "very much" 11 responded "mostly" 2 responded "not too much", and 1 responded "not at all." When students were asked if they were liked by the other school children, 22 responded that they were liked by "most of the children" 13 responded "some of the children," and 9 responded "all of the children." Similarly, when asked if teachers liked them, 25 responded "most of the time," 11 responded "all of the time," 6 responded "some of the time," and 2 responded "none of the time."

Children were asked if they liked learning in two languages. Thirty-four (77%) responded "very much," 6 (14%) responded "pretty much," and 2 responded "not much" and "not at all." An even stronger positive response was noted when students were asked if they enjoyed the special program in which they participated. Thirty-seven (84%) responded "very much," 5 (11%) responded "pretty much," and only 1 responded "not at all."

There was much less student agreement on whether children in the Gifted and Talented Program should be segregated from the other children. Only 26 (59%) thought that program children should be in a special class all of the time. Eight (18%) thought that they should be together in a special class "most of the time," 9 (20%) felt they should be segregated "some of the time," and 1, "none of the time."

There were four extra enrichment classes for students in the program; writing, art, dance and drama. All responding students

participated in the writing class. Of these, 39 (89%) said they liked this class "very much," 3 responded "pretty much," and one each responded "not so much" and "not at all."

Only 18 responding students participated in the special art class and 16 (89%) responded that they liked it "very much." Thirty-three of the responding students participated in the Drama class with 29 (88%) responding they liked it "very much" and 4 "pretty much."

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the high calibre of the overall school program, the base established in project years 1 and 2 upon which continued development and improvement of the program can be built, and the positive response to the Gifted and Talented Program on the part of parents and participating students, it is strongly recommended that funding be continued for this program.

The administrators and teachers at C.S. 211 should be commended on maintaining the Gifted and Talented Program through this transitional school year bridging two distinct administrations. Those directly involved in the program expressed positive attitudes towards the program and felt it provided real benefits to the student population. However, several problem areas have been encountered and these need to be resolved if all potential benefits are to be realized.

1. scope of program

The scope of intended activities as originally conceived was recognized this year as being far too broad-ranging to be realized. Dozens of objectives were set forth in all of the traditional content areas as well as in second language learning, cultural

awareness, career awareness, and the arts. It was impossible to identify appropriate didactic materials for all of these instructional objectives, especially in Spanish, as well as to orient and train staff in their use.

It is recommended that the more limited focus on language arts and the visual and performing arts be retained, and that within this more limited scope, a limited set of learning objectives be identified which are considered of highest priority.

2. Administration and Program Implementation

Administrative oversight was hindered in the first semester of the school year as a new principal assumed her duties and her time was completely consumed with establishing the base of her new administration. The outcome was a delay in implementation and a lack of clearly defined leadership for the program.

It is recommended that the school principal remain as Project Director in order to underline the importance of this program to the school's overall educational effort. But there is the need to designate one individual as the principal's deputy to be responsible for all aspects of the day-to-day workings of the program. The individual selected should be knowledgeable concerning the program, the student population, and hold the confidence of the principal as well as be respected within the school.

Among other duties, the deputy should be responsible for meeting, on a regular basis, with classroom teachers (including those without a high concentration of targeted students) to inform them of project activities and to seek their advice and assistance in project implementation.

3. Selection Procedure

The selection procedure employed this year, classroom teacher recommendation, has been criticised as not a highly valid means of screening for gifted and talented children. A search for a more reliable test is recommended for those children where intellectual giftedness is to be the criterion of selection. It must be realized that no one test will be appropriate for identifying both the gifted and the talented (artistic, creative, imaginative thinking, etc). Teacher recommendation might, in fact, be the best gauge of these skills if tempered with objectivity.

4. Testing Program

The data available from this year's testing program was inadequate to assess the degree to which learning objectives had been achieved. In addition, the available information was inappropriate for purposes of monitoring individual student progress.

It is recommended that the program deputy be made responsible for the project's testing program. Consultant services should be provided in order to 1) design an appropriate testing program which will enable program staff to monitor individual student progress and which will yield data needed to conduct program evaluation, and 2) present a workshop to program staff on the purposes and utility of the testing program. Further, for purposes of program evaluation, it is recommended that a limited and realistic number of program objectives be clearly defined and related to the data which can be provided by the testing program.

5. Resource Teachers

There is always a strong temptation to use resource teachers

to meet a sudden emergency. In true emergencies this is perfectly legitimate. But as a general rule, resource teachers should be shielded against being pulled away from project activities to perform other functions within the school.

6. Staff Development

The amount and type of training that teachers have received this year as part of this Title VII project is commendable. It is recommended that teachers continue to be supported in their desire to improve their professional skills. Renewal of the agreement with Fordham University to provide a course each term to teachers to be held at C.S. 211 is also recommended.

It is further recommended that the paraprofessionals assigned to the project be encouraged to take courses related to their work in the Gifted and Talented Program and that the program deputy be responsible for in-service orientation for these paras.

7. The Arts Program

The dance, drama, visual arts and creative writing activities have proved very successful in the first two years of the program. It has been particularly well received by the students.

It is strongly recommended that these activities be continued and that a consultant in photography be added. In addition, students in the program should be taken on trips to view these various arts in practice and/or exhibition. Parents of target students should be encouraged to participate in such outings.

8. Parent Involvement

Parents have had very positive views of the school and of the program and many have attended parent workshops and the parent ESL class.

It is recommended that these workshops be continued with emphasis on what parents can do to encourage and further develop their children's gifts and talents. Alternative times for meetings should be arranged (two sessions of the same workshop agenda) in order to accomodate working parents.

It is also recommended that the parent ESL class be continued and that native English speaking parents be encouraged to participate in these classes and serve as individual tutors to non-English speaking parents.

Appendix II

OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

Place _____ Date _____

I. Physical setting (describe briefly) _____
 regular classroom area _____
 special room _____
 area within larger space _____
 informal encounter setting _____

II. Background
 directed sound _____
 diffuse noise _____
 temperature _____
 other environmental conditions _____

III. Grouping
 whole class _____
 group (indicate size) _____
 individual _____

IV. Instructional Personnel
 teacher _____ paraprofessional _____ Bilingual Asst. _____ consultant _____
 cluster _____ administrator _____ other (specify) _____

V. Interaction
 A. Verbal
 _____ teacher dominated
 _____ teacher-student interactive (teacher initiating)
 _____ teacher-student interactive (teacher & student initiating)
 _____ teacher-whole group recitation
 _____ teacher-student-student (discussion)
 B. Non-verbal
 describe activity (individual/group; substance of activity) _____

VI. Materials
 book(s) (specify) _____
 other print _____
 audio/visual _____
 realia _____

VII. Language
 Principle language of instruction:
 language of the teacher _____
 language of the students _____
 Language consistency (approx. proportion of lesson time where
 "other" language is spoken, i.e., other than language
 determined for use in the lesson) _____
 Language facility (fluency, correctness)
 teacher/instructor _____ students _____

VIII. Aspects of the lesson specifically repated to the Gifted & Talented Program

A. Any "special" attention, activities, assistance, preference, etc., given to the G & T children vs. rest of group _____

B. Perceived level of performance/behavior of G & T children

IX. Degree of Formality

Arrangement of lesson area _____

Degree of teacher direction/control _____

X. Anecdotal Comments:

Observer's signature